

REMARKS

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-23 were rejected. Claims have been neither amended nor cancelled. Thus, claims 1-23 are pending and under consideration. No new matter has been added. The rejections are traversed below.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b):

At item 3 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-2, and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Nutter (US 5,287,030) cited by applicant. The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner asserts that Nutter discloses that “a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit by a predetermined length to rotate both ends of the rotating shaft on a fixed axis” as recited in claim 1. In contrast, the Nutter discloses bearings 32 on each side of a stator assembly 11 in order to hold opposite ends of a rotating shaft 24. The bearings 32 are not extending outwardly from the cavities 61, 62 of support unit 14 such that one of the bearings 32 is able to rotate the shaft 24 without the other of the bearings 32. As such, it is respectfully submitted that Nutter does not disclose the invention recited in claim 1.

By way of review, claim 2 sets forth “wherein the bearing has a rear part and the support unit has a boss that integrally and rearwardly extends from an edge of the through hole by a specified amount, with the rear part of the bearing being set in the boss.” It is noted that Nutter fails to disclose the features as recited in claim 2, and instead shows a boss 43 which is parallel to the opening 62. (see FIG. 1). As such, it is respectfully submitted that Nutter does not disclose the invention recited in claim 2.

Claims 6-8 are deemed patentable due at least to their depending from claims 1 and 2, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a):

At item 5 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 10-11, 15-16, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nutter (US Patent No. 5,287,030) cited by applicant, in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,528,773). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

For at least reasons similar to why Nutter does not disclose the features of claim 1, it is

respectfully submitted that Nutter does not disclose "a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit by a predetermined length to rotate both ends of the rotating shaft on a fixed axis" as recited in claim 10. Since Kim et al. is not relied upon as disclosing such a feature, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose the feature of claims 10 and 11.

For at least similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose "a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit" as recited in claim 15.

Additionally, while the Examiner acknowledges that Nutter fails to disclose a fan housing, a fan mounted to another side of the fan housing; and a fan motor rotate the fan, the fan motor being mounted to other side of the fan housing, the Examiner asserts that Kim et al. discloses a fan housing, a fan mounted to a side of the fan housing; and a fan motor rotate the fan, the fan motor being mounted to another side of the fan housing.

However, It is noted that Kim et al. discloses a circulating fan 52 (col. 4, lines 28-31), but fails to disclose the mechanism by which the fan 52 is attached or the existence of a fan housing meeting the features of claim 15, as recited. Since Nutter is not relied upon as disclosing such a feature, it is further respectfully submitted that the combination does not disclose or suggest "a fan housing," "a fan mounted to a side of the fan housing," and "a fan motor to rotate the fan, the fan motor being mounted to another side of the fan housing" as recited in claim 15.

Claims 16 and 20 are deemed patentable due at least the same reason as claim 15, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

By way of review, Nutter discloses that the bearing 32 is of a self lubricating plastic material, and teaches away from using oil. (Col. 7, lines 10-20 and lines 42-44). In contrast, claim 21 recites "an oil absorption member soaked with oil and a depressed seat provided around the through hole of the support unit, the oil absorption member being seated in the depressed seat to feed oil around the bearing as the rotating shaft rotates" and claim 22 recites "the oil absorption member is an annular oil absorption member." Thus, it is respectfully submitted that such features are neither taught nor suggested by Nutter nor Kim et al., and that Nutter does not disclose or suggest that the bearing 32

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 21 and 22 are further allowable over Nutter and Kim et al., and withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of these claims are earnestly solicited.

Additionally, there is no suggestion as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would use the electric motor of Nutter, which is suggested as being used for air circulation in a refrigerator, in a microwave oven such as that shown in Kim et al. Moreover, while the Examiner asserts in the Office Action that such a combination would have been made in order to circulate air in a microwave oven, there is no suggestion as to why the particular motor of Nutter would be used for such a purpose as opposed to the motor M shown in Kim et al. As such, it is respectfully submitted that there is insufficient evidence of a motivation to make the combination as is required to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of the claims.

At item 6 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 3-5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nutter (US Patent No. 5,287,030) cited by applicant, in view of Riback (US Patent No. 4,862,026). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Regarding claim 3, the Examiner admits that Nutter fails to disclose a front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than the rear part of the bearing. In order to cure this deficiency, the Examiner asserts that Riback discloses a front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than in diameter than the rear part of the bearing. In contrast, Riback fails to disclose diameters of the bearings but discloses a plurality of seal elements 52, 54, 56 (col. 4, lines 4-5). As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nutter and Riback does not disclose or suggest that "the front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than the rear part of the bearing" as recited in claim 3.

Regarding claims 4-5 and 9, the Examiner misunderstands claims 4-5 and 9 as depending from claim 3. It is noted that claims 4-5 and 9 are depending from claim 2.

By way of review, claim 4 sets forth "a stopper that fits over an insert groove formed around an outer surface of the rotating shaft in front of the bearing to prevent the rotator." As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nutter and Riback does not disclose or suggest that "a stopper that fits over an insert groove formed around an outer surface of the rotating shaft in front of the bearing to prevent the rotator" as recited in claim 4.

Claim 5 is deemed patentable due at least the same reason as claim 4, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Similar to above, regarding claim 9, the Examiner fails to point out the features recited in claim 9. Therefore, for at least the above, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is in proper condition for allowance.

Additionally, even assuming arguendo that Riback suggest a bearing having the larger diameter as asserted in the office action, there is no suggestion existing in the prior art as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would use the bearing of Riback in the electric motor of Nutter, or that the shaft 24 in Nutter is unstable when supported at both ends by bearings 32 such that the bearing of Riback should instead be used. Moreover, there is no evidence that the motivation used by the Examiner existed in the existing prior art. As such, it is respectfully submitted that there is insufficient evidence of a motivation to make the combination as is required to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of the claims.

At item 7 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 12-14, 17, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Nutter (US Patent No. 5,287,030) cited by applicant, in view of Kim et al. (US Patent No. 6,528,773) further Riback (US Patent No. 4,862,026). The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner admits that the combination of Nutter and Kim et al. fails to disclose “the front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than the rear part of the bearing.” However, the Examiner asserts that Riback discloses “a front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than the rear part of the bearing.” In contrast, Riback fails to disclose diameters of the bearings but discloses a plurality of seal elements 52, 54, 56 (col. 4, lines 4-5). As such, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Nutter/Kim and Riback does not disclose or suggest that “the front part of the bearing is larger in diameter than the rear part of the bearing” as recited in claim 12.

Claims 13-14, 17, 19 and 23 is deemed patentable due at least the same reason as claim 12, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Additionally, even assuming arguendo that Riback suggest a bearing having the larger diameter as asserted in the office action, there is no suggestion existing in the prior art as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would use the bearing of Riback in the electric motor of Nutter, or that the shaft 24 in Nutter is unstable when supported at both ends by bearings 32 such that the bearing of Riback should instead be used. Moreover, there is no evidence that the motivation used by the Examiner existed in the existing prior art. As such, it is respectfully submitted that there is insufficient evidence of a motivation to make the combination as is required to maintain a prima facie obviousness rejection of the claims.

At item 8 of the outstanding Office Action, claims 1, 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Umekage et al. (US Patent No. 5,393,961) in view of Palmer (US Patent No. 3,699,368).

Examiner admits that Umekage fails to disclose "a bearing inserted in the through hole of the support unit to rotatably hold the rotating shaft passing through the bearing, a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit." However, the Examiner asserts that Palmer discloses "a bearing inserted in the through hole of the support unit to rotatably hold the rotating shaft passing through the bearing, a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit," as recited in claim 1.

Even assuming arguendo that Palmer discloses "a bearing inserted in the through hole of the support unit to rotatably hold the rotating shaft passing through the bearing, a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit," Palmer is not cited for and does not cure the above noted deficiencies of Umekage. Therefore it is respectfully submitted that neither Umekage nor Palmer, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest how to combine supporting unit and a bearing having a front part of the bearing extending outwardly from the through hole of the support unit recited in claim 1. Claims 10 and 15 are deemed patentable due at least the same reason as claim 1, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding rejection is requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Oct 27, 2004
1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501

By: 
James G. McEwen
Registration No. 41,983